As readers of this journal will know, Maximian was a popular medieval author, valued particularly for imparting both good style and good morals to students. This is not Juster's Maximian, nor is it the Maximian of Roberts's introduction. Juster's Maximian is a serious poet. But having read the elegies through again, I am not so sure that this is the best or only Maximian. One wonders whether medieval schoolmasters were on to something: the Maximian of the *Elegies* does sometimes come across as an absurd caricature of the lusty old man rendered ridiculous by his lack of self-control. This translation will bring Maximian to an audience more familiar with Horace, Tibullus, or Milton, all subjects of Juster's previous translations, than Dracontius or the *Anthologia Latina*. And that—whatever reservations one might have—deserves unreserved praise.

Justin Stover, The University of Edinburgh

Anthony Kaldellis, *Byzantium Unbound*. (Past Imperfect.) Leeds: Arc Humanities Press, 2019. Paper. Pp. x, 103; 2 maps. $16.95. ISBN: 978-1-6418-9199-8.
doi:10.1086/714834

Anthony Kaldellis is a prolific scholar and certainly among the foremost historians of the Byzantine world in North America. He is also one of the most intellectually provocative and challenging, and his writing invariably generates vigorous discussion and sometimes strong disagreement. He is a scholar on a mission, and this short, well-written, and articulate book exemplifies that mission perfectly: to reinstate the study of Byzantine civilization and society as a foundational element in the historical study of post-Roman Europe and the Mediterranean, and to remove the cloak of Eurocentric and crusader "othering" of medieval eastern Roman culture and civilization that has beset its history for centuries. One important aspect of this is his insistence on calling the Byzantines what they in fact called themselves, Romans, and to call for an end to what he terms "Roman denialism." This is a theme that he has pursued for some time now; and while one might disagree with his particular interpretation of how eastern Romans after the fifth century understood their political system and attendant institutions, he is surely not wrong to underline the Roman identity—however we want to interpret and understand that—of the society we call Byzantium. While I do not disagree with the point about "denialism," I will, however, continue to refer to the medieval eastern Romans as Byzantines in the context of this review!

The book is divided into four chapters, the title of each of which indicates an element in this argument. Chapter 1, "A History of Byzantinophobia," examines the ways in which Byzantine history and the Byzantines have been deprived of their (self-) identity by the various layers of cultural colonialism imposed on them by others, both now and in the past. We are accustomed to thinking about the ways in which writers in the medieval West represented or misrepresented the eastern Roman state; we are aware of the injustices committed by Enlightenment narratives of Byzantine corruption and decadence; and we understand the roots of "modern" Byzantine studies in the classical tradition on the one hand and in Greek and Orthodox nationalisms and religious historiography on the other. And yet, as Kaldellis points out, much history-writing about Byzantium continues to think within the framework set by some of the caricatures and misrepresentations generated through these traditions. Chapter 2, "Thinking Historically with Byzantium," is a plea for a "long Roman history" that will challenge the periodization that currently dominates, in which the roots and configuration of Byzantine society and culture are obscured and to which the study of the eastern part of the Roman Empire has fallen prey. In this way, he argues, and by looking for the continuity of traditions, techniques, and practices that ignore any artificial and culturally subjective division between Roman, late Roman, or late antique and medieval,

we will see the real nature of eastern Roman civilization more clearly. Chapter 3, "Byzantium for Classicists," offers a challenge to the ways in which the twentieth- and twenty-first-century classical studies paradigm continues to ignore or marginalize the fact that most of the Greek texts that form its corpus were transmitted under Byzantine auspices in one form or another—not all, by any means, since one should not ignore the substantial contribution of the Islamic world in this respect. Yet Classics as a discipline continues to cut the history of the Greek language in two, paying little if any attention to what happens after c. 300 CE and ignoring the context in which classical texts were often used constructively by Byzantines. This once again reinforces the traditional Enlightenment idea that the Byzantines merely copied and repeated what had gone before with little, if any, intellectual input of their own. Kaldellis is only too ready to note that Byzantinists themselves are in many respects just as much to blame for perpetuating a certain Byzantine exceptionalism. And while there are many individuals who did or do not do this, from the point of view of the institutional structures inhabited by modern scholarship, the points Kaldellis makes have some purchase. The final chapter is entitled "Byzantium Was Not Medieval" and is in effect a plea both to reintegrate the study of Byzantium into its broader civilizational context and at the same time to raise it to equal status in the eyes of medievalists as well as classicists. Kaldellis argues that for it to assert its quality and identity as a vibrant and in many ways exceptional cultural system, we have to challenge the intellectual/cultural colonialism that has dominated the ways in which it has been viewed and understood, both by those outside the discipline as well as by those within, and to free Byzantium from the semantic and ideological constraints under which, according to Kaldellis, it continues to suffer.

There is much to stimulate and quite a lot to provoke in this short volume, and I have necessarily oversimplified a more sophisticated, detailed, and complex set of arguments. Many classicists will probably argue that their take on Byzantium is more enlightened and open than Kaldellis claims; many medievalists will no doubt argue likewise, although I do think Kaldellis is right in his general assertions about the ways these neighboring disciplines view the study of Byzantium. One does not have to agree with everything that Kaldellis says to sympathize with the overall perspective. Yet, having read the volume and sympathized with much of the reasoning, I cannot help thinking that it would have been equally useful in the concluding paragraphs to end with a little more optimism and make some reference to recent work both within and outside the field, a good deal of which is already setting a new agenda and tackling many of the issues to which Kaldellis refers.

John Haldon, Princeton University, Emeritus

Sarah Kay, *Animal Skins and the Reading Self in Medieval Latin and French Bestiaries*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2017. Pp. xv, 203; many color plates and black-and-white figures. $49. ISBN: 978-0-2264-3673-9. doi:10.1086/714645

Whatever we thought about bestiaries before reading Sarah Kay's *Animal Skins*, her tour de force of philology and philosophy offers new insights into the genre. Kay achieves this by first posing, then realizing, the seemingly irreconcilable tasks of showing how bestiaries were read in the Middle Ages and then demonstrating how we may do so fruitfully today. Thanks to skillful melding of material philology, philosophical anthropology, and ecological perception, Kay's mix of medieval and modern approaches breathes new life into bestiary studies.

From the outset, *Animal Skins* incorporates humans within the range of topics addressed by bestiaries, in the role of maker and consumer and also as possessors of a shared element: